

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 1)
July 2020**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT****DOCKETING STATEMENT****Case Number:** 23-1586**Short Case Caption:** Wireless Discovery LLC v. eHarmony, Inc.**Filing Party/Entity:** Defendant - Appellee eHarmony, Inc.

Instructions: Complete each section or check the box if a section is intentionally blank or not applicable. Attach additional pages as needed. Refer to the court's Mediation Guidelines for filing requirements. An amended docketing statement is required for each new appeal or cross-appeal consolidated after first filing.

Case Origin	Originating Number	Type of Case
D. Del.	1:22-cv-00480-GBW	830 Patent

Relief sought on appeal: ☒ None/Not Applicable
Relief awarded below (if damages, specify): ☐ None/Not Applicable

The District Court entered judgment after finding that the claims of the asserted patents were invalid under Section 101 of Title 35 of the United States Code.

Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from:

Order entered February 6, 2023 that eHarmony's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim is DENIED-IN-PART and GRANTED-IN-PART.

Nature of judgment (select one):

Date of judgment: 2/6/23☒ Final Judgment, 28 USC § 1295☐ Rule 54(b)☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type) _____☐ Other (explain) _____

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 2)
July 2020

Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court, and the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. ☐ None/Not Applicable

Wireless Discovery LLC v. The Meet Group, Inc. (No. 23-1582); Wireless Discovery LLC v. Coffee Meets Bagel, Inc. (No. 23-1583); Wireless Discovery LLC v. Down App, Inc. (No. 23-1584); Wireless Discovery LLC v. Grindr, Inc. (No. 23-1591); Wireless Discovery LLC v. Hily Corp. (No. 23-1592)

Issues to be raised on appeal: ☒ None/Not Applicable

Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If "yes," when were the last such discussions?

- ☐ Before the case was filed below
☒ During the pendency of the case below
☒ Following the judgment/order appealed from

If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If they were mediated, by whom?

Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain.

In light of the District Court's finding that the asserted patents are invalid, mediation is not expected to be productive.

Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.

Date: 3/29/23 Signature: /s/ Douglas A. Grady

Name: Douglas A. Grady